Picasso's Lenin Prize — Honor or Insult? P. 4

Documentary: The Resolution In Which ADA Broke With Kennedy to Oppose War in South Vietnam, Page 3

I. F. Stone's Weekly

VOL. X, NO. 18 MAY 7, 1962 WASHINGTON, D. C. 15 CENTS

The Nobel Laureates and the White House Dinner

In the wake of his order resuming nuclear testing in the atmosphere, Mr. Kennedy had the Nobel laureates of the hemisphere in to dinner. As public relations, this was superb. The picture of the President, surrounded by savants and writers, tended to counteract that other picture in the minds of angry demonstrators at home and abroad, the picture of an American President hurling new radioactive poisons into the heavens in a narrowly nationalistic, tit-for-tat contest with the Russians. The unexpected behavior of two guests, Dr. Linus Pauling and Clarence Pickett, though contrary to protocol and etiquette, lent a wonderful final touch. What could have provided a more civilized picture of our country abroad than the spectacle of a noted scientist and a saintly Quaker picketing the White House in protest against resumption before going in to have dinner with the President? Finally one cannot overlook the ingratiating pantomime, so appeasing to our own scientific community, in the presence at the dinner of J. Robert Oppenheimer, who was hounded out of government after opposing development of the H-bomb, and the absence from the dinner of Dr. Edward Teller, the monster's "father." Who could fail to be grateful to Mr. Kennedy for this fine gesture of reparation to Dr. Oppenheimer?

But The Victory Was Teller's

Unfortunately, though Dr. Teller didn't get invited to dinner, his is the victory. His Livermore Laboratory crowd hold the key positions in the bureaucracy where the problems of testing are decided: Harold Brown, chief of research at the Pentagon; George Bing, in charge of VELA-UNIFORM, which runs research into new means of detecting underground tests; Gerald Johnson, McNamara's assistant for atomic energy—all are out of Dr. Teller's team at Livermore laboratory. The decision to resume testing was their victory and the logic of Mr. Kennedy's address March 2 announcing the decision was their logic: the need for constant research and development to supply our arsenal with "the most modern, the most reliable and most versatile nuclear weapons"; the ambiguous but familiar Teller-like assurance that biological effects from new radioactivity in the new tests would be "roughly equal to only 1 percent of those due to . . . natural background," and the assumption that only an elaborate network of listening posts and inspectors can make a test moratorium safe though we seem to monitor every Russian test with ease within a few hours. The point we wish to make is not just that these considerations led to the resumption of testing. The point is that the same logic must lead us to engage every few years—when improved devices are ready—to a new series of tests after a new round of negotiations which are again only an exercise in propagandistic gamesmanship. In this direction there is no exit from a fatal spiral.

Mr. Kennedy's dinner was a gracious gesture, like the hot coffee he sent out to the picketing students last winter. But gracious gestures, whether so intended or not, are only public relations. Mr. Kennedy shows no readiness to engage in that campaign of public education necessary if we are to break out of the deadly spiral. Essentially he drifts gracefully with the tide. Against that background we suggest, quite seriously, that the Nobel laureates should have refused, in a body, to accept his invitation to dinner. We believe they owed it to science and to humanity to demonstrate that they could not acquiesce, by their presence, in a drift which endangers our whole species. Without disrespect to the Presidency or to Mr. Kennedy personally, they should have recognized that they symbolize Science, with all it could do for man if properly utilized, while he symbolizes the nation state system, which degrades science into providing ever more fiendish means of mass murder. Behind the glamorous facade of that splendid evening lies fatalistic acceptance of other future scenes—of suffering beyond the imagination of a Dante, inflicted on millions everywhere in some stupid big power quarrel over a point of prestige or of "honor." The scientists should have urged Mr. Kennedy instead to use the powers of his great office to awaken mankind to the danger and to the need for a fresh approach. This was their duty and this is his duty, and only in this should he have the strengthening accompaniment of our best minds and spirits.

Our Favorite Kennedy

Our favorite Kennedy is now Caroline. Hers seems to have been the really historic remark at the dinner the President gave the Nobel Prize winners at the White House the other evening. In the receiving line, Mrs. Kennedy said reproachfully to Mrs. Linus Pauling, whose husband had been picketing the White House before coming in to dinner, "How could you do such a thing? You know Caroline asked me, 'What has Daddy done wrong this time?'" At least one Kennedy seems to watch picket lines carefully.

Mr. Kennedy himself greeted Dr. Pauling with a grin and said, "Well it seems like you've been around the White House a couple of days already." On Saturday Dr. Pauling carried a sign against resumption of testing with Women Strike for Peace. On Sunday he joined the Quaker vigil outside the White House, as did another dinner guest, Clarence Pickett, secretary emeritus of the American Friends Service Committee which won a deserved Nobel Peace prize in the 1940's. Should Nobel Prize dinners, and resumption of testing, alike become annual events, the least the guests can do is to picket before going in to dinner.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

JFK Evangelical in Latin America About Evils He Takes Calmly In Our Own South

A Climax Approaches in the Struggle for Negro Voting Rights

The coming two weeks will be climactic in the struggle for Negro voting rights. On Wednesday next, Majority Leader Mansfield will ask cloture to shut off the Southern filibuster against the bill to make proof of a sixth grade education the only literacy requirement for voters, thus ending one device for disfranchising the Negro. If more than a majority vote for cloture, Mansfield will use the device of a motion to table his own bill (which is not debatable). If this is defeated—as he hopes—debate will go on for another week at least, culminating in a second vote for cloture. At least three Republicans, and possibly the same number of Democrats, have said they will vote for cloture on the second round. It is important to make that vote as big as possible.

A Strange Apathy

Unfortunately this battle over voting rights has brought little mail and pressure from the country even from those Northern areas where the Negro counts politically. Although the solid south can now be sure of only 20 votes (Yarborough of Texas and Randolph of West Virginia are mavericks on the voting issue as on so much else) and 33 votes are necessary to block cloture in a full Senate, the old alliance with Republicans from the Plain States and Democrats from the Mountain States still holds. Enough votes can usually be mustered from these two areas to maintain white supremacy in the South in return for Southern votes for the special privileges in which mining and farm Senators are interested.

Now is the time for Negroes and the friends of real democracy to bring pressure on both party leaderships. Here an odd situation exists. There has been criticism of the White House for carrying on a political romance with Dirksen of Illinois at the expense of the liberal Democrat, Yates, who opposes him for reelection. On this issue, Dirksen is more militant than the White House. His anxiety about reelection in Illinois, where the Negro vote is potent, has led him to put the heat on his fellow Republicans. But there is as yet no sign of similar pressure by the White House on the Democrats. Attorney General Robert Kennedy has come out strongly for the literacy bill, but White House sources are noncommittal when asked what it intends to do about rounding up votes.

It is a pity the White House is not as militant about democracy in the South as it is away from home. It could do a lot, if only by calling attention to the study made last year by the Civil Rights Commission of 17 black belt counties in which the Negro is in the majority but remains effectively disfranchised. Its subdued and restrained pages paint a vivid picture of one party dictatorship, of naked racist oppression and of feudal rule by the big white cotton planters. Some Latin American ought to use that report for a tongue-in-cheek plea for land and fiscal reform in these areas ruled by our own oligarchy. Even Negroes who are major taxpayers can't vote. In one county spotlighted by the report a Negro merchant pays $2,000 a year in taxes but they won't let him pay his $2 poll tax. It would be hard to match that even in Peru. Let the White House and your Senators know you're concerned.

The SEP's Belated Expose of the N-Bomb

"At the present stage of world nuclear progress, it is scientifically unlikely that anybody can perfect an N-bomb for nearly half a century. And if they should, its military application is so limited that it would be as expensive and absurd as killing flies with a big-game rifle. Nor is it right to reach a quivering assumption that there can be no defense against an N-bomb. On the contrary, it is easier to guard against this theoretical weapon than against A-bombs or H-bombs."

—The Neutron Bomb, by Wm. L. Laurence in the Saturday Evening Post May 5, is a devastating reply to the nightmarish campaign staged by Connecticut's Senator Dodd and others last year to panic the U.S. into atmospheric testing. "If the Soviets were to get it [the neutron bomb] first," Dodd said, "it might very well cost us our freedom." Now this veteran science writer replies, "it would be sheer nonsense to rush into a multi-billion dollar program to develop a neutron bomb" and "equally silly to use the neutron bomb as a reason for resuming atomic tests in the atmosphere." Query: How long has the SEP been holding this answer to a speech Dodd made last July and why is it published only now after testing in the atmosphere has been resumed?—IFS.

"This Is War Waged in Peacetime"—The Aldermaston Petition to the United Nations

"Just as we condemned the resumption of tests by the USSR as a crime against humanity we likewise denounce the series ordered by the President of the United States as (in his own terms) the 'substitution of terror for reason.' The massive series of tests will, with certainty, be followed by further tests by the USSR.

"This is war waged in peacetime against nations who have no part in this struggle for arms supremacy and against innocent peoples of all nations whose lives and health are in danger. The biological effects cannot be magnified nor minimized because they are unpredictable. The risks must be measured not by scientific knowledge but by scientific ignorance. This has been recognized by the United Nations when it constituted the continuing Scientific Committee on the Effects of Atomic Radiation which enjoined the cessation of contamination of the environment by explosions of nuclear weapons.

"Arguments of political expediency or military necessity cannot override the rights of the individual; the considerations of genocide where the genus is homo sapiens; the freedom of the seas; the necessity to conserve the living-space of mankind against the pollution of the atmosphere and to prevent the radioactive poisoning of the communal oceans with the contamination of the food cycle. . . ."

—After this year's Aldermaston March which reached 60,000 by the time it arrived in Hyde Park, two deputations were appointed by the British Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament, one to Geneva and the other to New York with this petition for U Thant, Acting Secretary General of the United Nations. It was brought here by Lord Boyd Orr, Nobel Peace prize-winner, and first director of the UN Food and Agriculture Committee; Prof. Ritchie Calder, Vice Chairman of CND, and Mrs. Patricia Goldacre, rank-and-file member. U Thant was too busy lunching the Duke and Duchess of Windsor to see them but they presented their petition April 27.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

He Turns Out To Be A Somewhat Stuffy Man With Conventional Half-Baked Ideas

Former CIA Chief Dulles Sits For An Authorized Protrait on CBS

In his interview with Eric Severeid on CBS Reports, April 26, former CIA Director Allen W. Dulles denied that followers of Batista played a large role in the Cuban invasion forces last year despite a White House order; denied that the activities of CIA have ever conflicted with official State Department policy; denied that CIA operatives have tended to back right wing elements in foreign countries "because of an obsession with Communism." The CIA seems to have kept a lot of secrets from its own director.

Admits Majority of Cubans Were With Castro

There were also some interesting admissions. When Mr. Dulles was asked about the report in a new book on the CIA that its operatives "spent literally millions of dollars, hiring people to riot in the streets . . . to get rid of Mossadegh" in Iran, Mr. Dulles replied "the statement that we spent many dollars doing that is utterly false." Apparently Iranian street mobs come cheap. When Mr. Severeid asked why he took so long before acting against Castro, Mr. Dulles asked, "What were you going to do about it? Castro was in there, with the great support of the majority of the people, and if we had planned any expedition at an earlier date, that might not have been of any more success than the one that we did after rather mature preparations." He admitted that "particularly in its latter phases" the Cuban invasion affair "exceeded the scope of the normal activities of the CIA," and that such activities "should be of a nature that could be kept quiet." He thinks the Soviet danger in the Congo was "overrated" and he implied that the Japanese surrender might have been brought about without atomic bombing.

There were glimpses of just how profoundly Mr. Dulles assesses men and events. When in Switzerland during the war, he consulted with Dr. Carl Jung on what Hitler would do. Dr. Jung was remarkably fuzzy-minded, if not worse, on Nazism but Mr. Dulles thought him "very, very good on that." From him, Mr. Dulles learned that Hitler was "an introvert, I believe . . . as compared to . . . Mussolini . . . an extra-extravert" Mr. Dulles himself is "somewhat of a disciple of Pavlov, an an interpreter of what Khrushchev does." Mr. Dulles said that when Khrushchev broke off the Paris conference, the U-2 was only "an excuse in the Pavlovian manner." But a few moments later Mr. Dulles was saying, in a quite sensibly non-Pavlovian way, that the Russians "felt so sensitive" about the U-2 because it breached the secrecy on which they counted for security. Mr. Dulles doesn't think Communism within the United States is a serious matter "due to the vigilance of the FBI and what J. Edgar Hoover has done." Some misguided people tend to give the credit to a free and affluent society with a high degree of social welfare reforms. Mr. Dulles sees our stability as a testimonial to the secret police. That was the interview's most revealing moment.

What Khrushchev Told Dulles

Eric SEVEREID: Mr. Dulles, when Khrushchev was here, did you get a chance to talk with him at all?

Allen W. DULLES: Yes. I didn't have a long talk with him, but I had a very—quite an amusing encounter with him. It took place at the dinner that President Eisenhower gave for Khrushchev, and the President introduced me, and said: 'This is Mr. Dulles. You may know Mr. Dulles.' He turned to his reporters [sic], kind of a twinkle in his eye, because he's got a keen—you must admit, he's got a good sense of humor, and he said: 'Oh, yes. I know you. I read your reports.'

Mr. SEVEREID: Really?

Mr. DULLES: Yes. And I said: 'I hope you get them legally' And, 'Oh,' he said, 'you know how we get them. We all pay the same agents and we all get the same reports.' And, 'Well,' I said, 'That's a kind of sharing the wealth, isn't it?' And then we had a laugh and that ended it.

—"The Hot and Cold Wars of Allen Dulles" on CBS-TV April 26. The real point of this famous exchange is that in many undeveloped—and some devcloped—countries espionage is a kind of WPA providing work for the local sharpies, and the same busy entrepeneurs sell the same tripe, differently packaged, to both sides.

The Resolution in Which The ADA Broke With Kennedy on Our War in South Vietnam

"We view with grave anxiety and concern the military intervention of the United States in South Vietnam without invoking the good offices of the United Nations, without deference to the International Supervisory Commission under the 1954 Geneva Treaty, without coordination with our SEATO allies, and without making clear to the Congress and the American people the reasons—if they exist—which would justify such unilateral military intervention.

"The civil war in South Vietnam has been presented to the American people as having been caused primarily by foreign intervention. In truth, that civil war is in the main the result of the decay of the totalitarian Diem regime. This regime has lost popular support, and the people of South Vietnam are either actively hostile or indifferent to it.

"We do not oppose, indeed we favor, reasonable military aid to countries which are seeking to maintain their independence from external aggression, including externally aided and directed subversion, even though we may not wholly approve of their governments. But we vigorously oppose the unilateral commitment of America's own military power and prestige to sustain governments in Asia or elsewhere against the resistance of their own people.

"No one is in a position to predict whether Red China or the USSR will intervene against us, or the gravity of the consequence of their intervention. But no one can deny that unilateral military intervention involves an important moral problem and grave political and military risks, which may imperil the whole future of America. The American people have not been informed of these risks and they have the right to know and knowingly to share in decisions which may irreversibly affect their destiny."

—Of the resolutions adopted by Americans for Democratic Action at its 15th annual convention in Washington April 27-29 this resolution on Vietnam was the most urgent, the most newsworthy, and the most clearly in opposition to the Kennedy Administration. Few papers mentioned it so we supply the text here. The ADA also adopted a resolution on disarmament and security deploring "the resumption of testing by the Soviet Union and the US" but struck out the next sentence of the recommended draft, "We are opposed to further nuclear tests by any nation." The resolution called for negotiation of a ban on atmospheric tests without inspection since such tests are detectible.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Greatest Living Painter Is Honored in Both East and West But—

Poor Pablo Picasso — Neither Side Wants the Whole Man

In Moscow, Picasso has just been awarded the Lenin Peace Prize, but Russia's extensive pre-revolutionary collection of his work is still shut off from the public. In New York, where few artists dare any longer to be Communists like Picasso, nine galleries are cooperating in an American tribute with the most elaborate exhibition of his works yet seen in this country. America forgives his politics for his painting. Russia forgives his painting for his politics. Poor Pablo Picasso: neither side accepts the whole man.

The greatest painter of our time is nevertheless better off in the West than he would have been in the East. France gave him refuge from Fascism, allowed him political freedom, and above all left him free to paint as he pleased. Capitalist collectors have outbid themselves for his work.

Had Picasso Been A Russian Painter

Had Picasso been a Russian painter, he would have been driven into exile or liquidated long ago as were so many artists of his generation who failed to toe the party line in the arts. Just last week in *Novy Mir*, Ehrenburg's memoirs told the story of how the Russian painter Falk, a follower of Cezanne, was driven by the authorities into total poverty. While the capitalist world shows a cultivated taste for revolutionary art, the proletarian State under Stalin and even now under Khrushchev shares all the predilections that artists used to stigmatize as philistine and bourgeois. In the arts, the Russian Revolution brought Babbitt to power.

In Communist Russia, as in Nazi Germany, Picasso was regarded as decadent. No one in the ruling Russian Communist bureaucracy ever asked himself how it was that a decadent artist should have taken so bold a part in the fight against Fascism, risked so much in the peace campaigns, dared even to become a Communist. Bureaucrats are incapable of such questions.

The vision that burns in Picasso's paintings is the vision that burns in his life. If integrity is wholeness, his life and work are a monument of integrity. To reject his painting is to reject his life. To award him the Lenin Prize while refusing to let the Russian public see his painting is not an honor. It's an insult. It says "We toss you a decoration for what we can use of you." It says "We welcome non-conformity abroad for the use we can make of it but we don't encourage it at home even in so non-political a field as painting."

Picasso has lived by the belief that the artist must take part in the great struggles of his time for peace and justice. He showed his conscience had not been drugged by Communist Party membership when he spoke up for the Hungarian revolutionists in 1956. To liberate Soviet artists from bureaucratic interference and control is one of the political tasks of our time. Picasso could make a mighty contribution in this field and help his unhappy fellow painters in the Soviet Union by sending his Lenin Prize back. With it should go a message saying he would be happy to accept it when they, too, are free to paint as they please.

Hat's Off To David Susskind

Our hat is off to David Susskind for appearing as an expert witness in behalf of John Henry Faulk in his $1,000,000 suit against AWARE, Inc., Vincent Hartnett and that wealthy busy-body grocer, Lawrence Johnson of Syracuse, for ruining his career as a radio-TV entertainer. It was no small thing for a man with as far-flung interests in the industry as Mr. Susskind to appear in the witness stand, to name names and to reveal the full extent of the blacklist in the 1950's. He testified that no less than 1,500 actors, writers, directors and technicians had been blacklisted as "politically undesirable." He said that in programs he produced during that period he had to submit the names of 5,000 persons in the entertainment field for "clearance" to the advertising firm of Young & Rubicam, that about one-third were rejected, that these rejections made his programs "artistically unworkable" and led to much hardship for performers. He testified that when he begged the agency to let the blacklisted confront their accusers, he was told they could not help him "they were caught in a trap." This was the kind of Kafka-style drama played out behind the "free world" facade in the 50's. We wonder how much of it continues, and to what extent it has ebbed only because performers have been taught the hard way that they endanger their bread-and-butter if they dare take a position on controversial issues.

Geneva Issues Still Available Free If You Send Stamped Self-Addressed Envelope

I. F. Stone's Weekly, 5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W. Washington 15, D. C.

Please renew (or enter) my sub for the enclosed $5:

Name .....

Street .....

City .....**Zone**.....**State**.....

5/7/62

Enter gift sub for $2 (6 mos.) or $4 (1 yr.) additional:

(To) Name .....

Street .....

City .....**Zone**.....**State**.....

Shall we send gift announcement? **Yes** ☐ **No** ☐

I. F. Stone's Weekly
5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W.
Washington 15, D. C.

NEWSPAPER

Second class postage paid at Washington, D. C.

I. F. Stone's Weekly. Second Class Postage Paid at Washington, D. C. Published every Monday except the last Monday in August and the first in September and the last Monday in December and the first in January at 5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W., Washington, D. C. An independent weekly published and edited by I. F. Stone; Circulation Manager, Esther M. Stone. Subscription: $5 in the U. S.; $6 in Canada; $10 elsewhere. Air Mail rates: $15 to Europe; $20 to Israel, Asia and Africa.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED